



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Bible makes any use whatever of the wonderful meanings which the word is supposed to include and to convey. I have, however, already exceeded the limits of a review. Enough has been said, I think, to show that while Professor Robertson's book is often ingenious and suggestive, and may here and there correct a critical error or exaggeration, it leaves the main results of criticism entirely unshaken, and so far does not deserve the high encomium which a number of conservative critics have meted out to it. If the orthodox party intend to lean upon this book, I fear they will be no better off than Hezekiah was when he determined to depend upon Egypt. To them, too, might fitly be applied the warning of the Rab-shakeh. Whether even so they will be saved, remains to be seen.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE HEXATEUCH.

The Genesis of Genesis. By B. W. BACON. (Hartford: The Student Publishing Company, 1892.)

The Composition of the Book of Genesis. By E. I. FRIPP. (London: Nutt. 1892.)

Documents of the Hexateuch. Translated and arranged by W. E. ADDIS. Vol. I.—The Oldest Book of Hebrew History. (London: Nutt. 1892.)

THE first two of these three works deal with the same subject, but on a different scale. Our readers will be able to judge of their contents if we first indicate briefly the plan of each, and then notice some points of interest elucidated by them.

Professor Bacon's is the larger book, and is much the most complete edition of the kind in English, and, so far as we are aware, in any language. Kantzoch and Socin have produced their convenient German text, with the documents in different types. Professor Bacon does this also, using the English of the revised version. But he has made his edition pre-eminently useful and convenient by the thorough way in which he has executed his task. The varieties of type are well chosen and really distinctive, while by the use of smaller type of similar character he has been able to discriminate the editorial passages very helpfully. The foot-notes are reduced to the smallest limits, but are sufficient to show the suggested *rationale* of the analysis. And by a careful system of references the reader is enabled largely to check the results for himself. These results, moreover, where original, are frequently so ingenious and convincing as

to lead us to place Mr. Bacon quite in the front rank of analytical critics.

But besides the text in this form, we find it also as separated out into the three main documents, which are successively printed in full, the passages belonging to each being grouped so as to come into connection with one another, and conjectural restorations of portions omitted being inserted within square brackets.

To this the American Professor has prefixed three introductory chapters. The first creates a reasonable presumption in favour of the analysis by exhibiting with a wealth of interesting detail the many phenomena within and without the limits of the Bible, which prove that Oriental literary works constantly only survive by being merged in a later compilation, and also that the task of detecting and even separating the components of such a work is capable of being successfully accomplished. In the second he shows what a flood of light historical criticism can throw upon a book, by pointing out that (1) certain passages are inconsistent with the date which has been traditionally assigned to them, and (2) that certain other passages betray their connection with some later era, to which critics are now disposed to assign them. In the third chapter, he simply outlines Dillmann's analysis of Genesis.

Thus, for those who come to the study of Genesis unconvinced of the truth of the critical conclusions, Professor Bacon's book is admirably adapted from its fulness of material. Scholars also will find the edition, with its useful cross references and double form of the text, a very convenient and instructive one.

But Mr. Fripp's *Composition of the Book of Genesis* will be an invaluable aid to those who are generally persuaded that the book is composite, but have neither leisure nor learning to study elaborate critical works. Here, in a most handy and inexpensive form, they can see what are the results of criticism as applied to the Book of Genesis. In the concisest fashion the author describes the process by which he believes the book to have grown, gives a list of the passages ascribed to each component, justifies the relative dates proposed, and brilliantly summarises the characteristics of each original writer. A series of ingenious sketch-maps illustrates the connection of various cycles of stories with periods in the national history. The full text of Genesis is given in a new translation, but the verses are distributed amongst the three main sources, a table at the end giving the page where any particular verse may be found. Thus the use of this part of the work is not so much as a guide to the analysis chapter by chapter, but rather as a reconstruction of the fundamental documents, at the same time exhibiting the changes which they have undergone at the hands

of successive compilers or editors, and from this point of view we may confidently say that any one reading through the three as they are here consecutively printed will get an impression of their character and contents which he need not fear will be in important particulars modified by subsequent research. A word may be said as to the arrangement. The Priestly narrative is duly printed separately at the end, but it is not easy to see what is gained by placing the two lines of Prophetic narrative in parallel columns or pages, for it is only rarely that the parallels on one opening are *apropos* of one another, and the distinction of type is so slight as to produce a certain amount of confusion.

The useful running analysis, justifying by copious references the distribution of verses adopted in the text, might just as well have formed a chapter in the introduction, instead of being printed at the foot of the page as a sort of *feuilleton*, for there are no numerals or signs to connect the various passages with the section relevant to them. But by following this analysis through, with a copy of the R. V. open before him, the student may soon learn to thread his way through the mazes of documentary criticism as applied to Genesis. Scholars will value this work also, not only as enabling them to estimate the nature of the component documents more easily in their separate form, but as giving an independent and acute attempt at solving the various problems which successively present themselves to those who would first analyse and then reconstruct a composite work like the Book of Genesis.

We come now to a work planned upon a larger scale than the two former. Mr. Addis includes the entire Hexateuch within the range of his investigations, and in this volume he presents us with the first half of the contemplated whole. The remainder is promised early in 1893, and we hope that it will appear without fail, for the writer brings very valuable qualities to the execution of his task. His acquaintance with the literature is both wide and thorough. His judgment is discriminating, and his moderation and reverence are apparent throughout. He states his conclusions with studied sobriety and caution, and handles disputed points with so sure and delicate a touch, that the reader feels that the decision has not been reached till every reasonable alternative has been duly weighed. At the same time the author has so severely limited himself to the exhibition of such results as may be held to have received the measure of demonstration which the nature of the subject admits, that it is a little tantalising to the student who has already become convinced of the truth of these conclusions not to hear more of what the author thinks of less settled points. Still it is often possible to see in what direction

his judgment leans; and the very fact of this limitation makes his work peculiarly adapted for study by those who are only slightly acquainted with the subject.

The contents of the present volume may be briefly outlined thus :—There are nearly a hundred pages of introductory matter. In the first half of these the author re-writes that most interesting chapter in literary history which relates to the changes of opinion about the Hexateuch from the earliest times to the present day. He cannot be said to add much that is new to what has been already written, but no one has brought out more concisely and clearly the significance of each stage, or the precise bearing of each successive writer's contribution to the discussion. After this come sections which aim at proving that the Hexateuch is composite, that its four main elements can be separated with sufficient accuracy, and that the approximate date of each may be discovered. This part, of course, does not pretend to be exhaustive, but it always shows a firm grasp of the questions at issue, and gives in an untechnical form, easily to be followed by non-professional readers, all the best and most cogent arguments, each elaborated and supported with sufficient fulness and recognition of opposing arguments to produce substantial conviction in any unprejudiced mind. The concluding words may be given in full :—" Unless this introductory sketch has wholly failed in its object, it will enable those who had little previous acquaintance with the subject to see the divergence between critical results and the traditional view of the Hexateuch. It is not the work of one hand, but of many. If we put aside a few fragments of ancient song, the earliest document cannot be much earlier than the ninth century before Christ, and is therefore posterior by many centuries to the time of Moses. True, we have at least four witnesses instead of one. But the earliest of these witnesses is anonymous and late; the witnesses on the one hand copy each other, on the other hand contradict each other; the oldest among them proceeds on unhistorical assumptions; each in his order displays an increasing taste for the marvellous, and wanders further from the fact. We cannot out of such materials construct the early history of Israel. We may feel sure that Israel's sojourn in Goshen, the deliverance by Moses, the temporary union of the Hebrews, and the beginning of a higher religion under his influence, are facts that cannot be shaken. We can lay the finger here and there on precious fragments which enable us to form some idea of the way in which the Hebrews conquered Canaan. That is about all. Even the noble narrative of the Jahvist is not sober history. Yet in another and a very real sense the Hexateuch becomes in the hands of scholars a history of unique interest. It is not, indeed, the history

of Abraham and Jacob, of Moses and Joshua. It is the history—a history which cannot deceive any more than the history deciphered by geologists on the rocks can deceive—of religious ideas. And to Christians the history of that religion which prepared the way for Christ has, and must have, supreme value.”

The “Documents of the Hexateuch” are in this edition described as “translated and arranged in chronological order.” And accordingly in this first volume we have, besides the introduction, what is called “the oldest book of Hebrew history”—an expressive though somewhat cumbrous title, which is habitually used by the author to describe what is best known to students under the formula “J.E.” He protests, with justice, against its being called the “Prophetic History,” as by Kuenen and others (including Mr. Fripp), for, as he points out, Kuenen himself notices how some of its most remarkable features are characteristic of the pre-Prophetic period. This document, itself composite, is presented here continuously, J and E being distinguished by different types only where the analysis is reasonably certain. Additions by the editor of JE are marked by round brackets, emendations or reconstructions of the author by square brackets. The “Priestly” passages, both original and editorial, disappear from the page, and can only be traced by the numbering when they extend to half a verse or more. In Exodus-Joshua, J has a distinctive type as well as E; but in Genesis there is no distinction in the text between passages ascribed to J and those left doubtful, though the notes indicate the doubt where it exists. And generally so much is left doubtful, without being definitely assigned to J or E, that it would be hard for any one to read either of these documents consecutively from this text.

We may now take up some particular points of interest, and see how they are treated by the three writers under consideration. (The initial letters of their surnames will be used for brevity.)

(1.) The Creation and Flood stories.—All three authors are agreed that, after the “Priestly” parts have been removed, the remainder is still composite; and also that the section on the murder of Abel (iv. 2-16*a*), with the birth of Seth (iv. 25, 26), as well as the Flood story and the genealogies in x., are of later origin than the rest. B. and F. add the geographical note in ii. 10-15, and B. also, iii. 22-24. A. adopts no theory of the process of composition; F. suggests that two Chaldæan stories, one of the Creation, the other of the Flood, and both already in Hebrew form, were united with a pure Hebrew story of Cain and Abel, and so linked on to the history of the Hebrew patriarchs. B. has a more ambitious scheme. He suggests that all the separable passages formed part of a connected story,

which he reconstructs in an appendix, on the assumption that it supplied P. with the materials for its narrative, not only of the Flood, but even of the Creation. (In this, of course, he is following Budde, while both Wellhausen and Kuenen have expressed views tending in this direction.) He does not decide whether the author of the J passages in the rest of Genesis found these differences in his sources, or whether the second thread was subsequently interwoven.

(2.) The rescue of Lot (Gen. xiv.) and the adultery of Judah (Gen. xxxviii.).—B. and F. pronounce the former to be a late Babylonian *Midrash*; and A. implies a similar verdict by omitting it from the “oldest book of Hebrew history.” The latter is given by B. and A. to J, though they admit the want of connection. They point out in it the legendary reflection of historical reminiscences of the mingling of Judah with Canaanite tribes. F. views it as a late *Midrash*, like Ruth and Judges xix.

(3.) The vision of Abraham (Gen. xv.).—The difficulty of this chapter is acknowledged by all. A. gives no analysis, but recognises traces both of E and of a “Priestly” redactor. B. offers an attractive and plausible distribution, giving vv. 1, 3^a, 2^b, 5, 13^{ab}, 15, 16 to E; vv. 7-11, 17, 18, 2^a, 3^b, 4, 6 to J; and the rest to editors. F. produces parallels which suggest that B. has left too much as original, but which scarcely justify him in assigning the whole chapter to the inventiveness of editors.

(4.) The death of Abraham (Gen. xxiv.).—All three agree with the suggestion that Abraham's death was here described by J, and that it is his, and not Sarah's, that is alluded to in the last verse. B. and F. transpose to follow this chapter the account of Isaac and Rebekah at Gerar in chap. xxvi., thus making the story intelligible. B. also cleverly gets over the difficulty about the section xxi. 31-33 (which A. sees plainly to be out of place where it is) by exchanging it with xxvi. 33. (F. similarly, but less happily.)

(5.) Isaac blessing Jacob (Gen. xxvii.).—A. points out the proofs of the presence of two stories combined, but pronounces it impossible to sever them. F. separates out all that must belong to E, and leaves the greater part for J. B. effects a very thorough, and—we think—successful, division, the details of which are worked out in *Hebraica* for January, 1891. He has shown that it is possible to arrange the material so that the two narratives dovetail into one another without requiring to assume any additions by the compiler.

(6.) Jacob at Peniel.—B. and F. seem to have more justification here than A., who gives vv. 13-21 to E, but the whole of the scene at Peniel to J, whereas the former leave vv. 13 ff., as the continuation of J, and give v. 30 (with or without another clause or two) to E.

(7.) The selling of Joseph (Gen. xxxvii.).—This chapter is one of the best to illustrate the success of the analytical process, and is very carefully done in all three books. The argument seems to reach demonstration here.

In Exodus and the following books we part company with F. and B., though for the story of the plagues we have B.'s excellent monograph in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1890). And we must express our regret that A. does not seem to have seen this, and only echoes the verdict of most critics that the two sources are so fused as to be indistinguishable. On the contrary, when the right clues are followed, they fall apart with startling clearness, and leave two narratives marked respectively by abundant features of individuality.

And so throughout the rest of the Hexateuch we do not find Mr. Addis venturing upon any new suggestion for fresh analysis; in deed he rather shrinks from a decision where the great German and Dutch critics are at variance amongst themselves. Usually, however, the materials for a judgment are briefly given in a note. In Joshua he is as modest in his conclusions as elsewhere, but he has made good use of previous work, finding the essay of Albers (*Quellen-bericht in Jos.* i.-xii., 1890) particularly serviceable. As regards the difficult problem of the Sinaitic legislation, it may be interesting to note that this latest enquirer is a fresh upholder of Kuenen's view that the "Book of the Covenant" originally occupied the place of Deuteronomy, and was only put back to its present position to make way for the intruded Deuteronomic legislation.

G. HARFORD-BATTERSBY.

The Recent Translations and the Ethiopic Text of the Book of Enoch.

I.

THE recent translations which we propose to review briefly here are to be found in Dillmann's *Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt*, 1853; Schodde's *The Book of Enoch translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes*, 1882; and Goldschmidt's *Das Buch Henoch aus dem Aethiopischen in die ursprünglich hebräische Abfassungssprache zurückübersetzt; mit einer Einleitung und Noten versehen*, 1892.

These translations are all professedly founded on the Ethiopic text of Enoch, published by Dillmann in 1851. To the criticism of this text we hope to address ourselves in the next number of the QUARTERLY.

In the present review we must limit our consideration to the